

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/827,460	04/19/2004	Paul M. Wojciechowski	030048060US1	2994	
25096 7	590 09/22/2004		EXAMINER		
PERKINS CO			DINH, TIE	DINH, TIEN QUANG	
PATENT-SEA P.O. BOX 124			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			3644		
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/200	DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			KM			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/827,460	WOJCIECHOWSKI, PAUL M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tien Dinh	3644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timel n the mailing date of this co				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·		•			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the	merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 36-59 is/are pending in the application	n.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 36-59 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
6) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/c	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			TD 4 4047-10			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat ofty documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage			

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/19/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

6) Other: _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Attachment(s)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 36-53, 58-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy et al in view of the admitted prior art on page 2 and figures 1A-C and Klose or Franz.

Murphy et al discloses a method of manufacturing an aircraft wing with a forward inboard wing portion that integrates an engine support structure that is in front of the leading edge (see figure 1) and a landing gear support structure that is integrated to the aft inboard wing portion toward the trailing edge (see figures 4-6 and 1), but Murphy et al is silent on the use of chordwise wing insert portion to the forward and aft inboard wing portions and attaching the spanwise wing insert portion to the outboard wing portion and to the forward and aft inboard wing portions. Murphy et al is silent on deriving a second wing from a first wing. However, Klose discloses chordwise and spanwise wing insert portions are well known in the art.

Furthermore, Franz discloses a chordwise wing insert 26, 28, or 30 and spanwise wing insert 16 are well known in the art. The admitted prior art on page 2 and figures 1A-C discloses that deriving wings are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have derived wings by using chordwise and spanwise wing inserts in Murphy et al's system as taught by the admitted prior art on page 2 and figures 1A-1C and Klose or Franz to easily

Art Unit: 3644

assemble the wing and to repair the wings if needed. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to derive the wings so that an aircraft can do different missions with a reduced cost.

Please note that wing-roots in a derived wing are inherent.

Re claims 40-41, 50, to derive a new wing that has different sweep angles merely involve steps that one skilled in the art would have done to get a desired wing for the missions to be accomplished.

Re claims 42-44, 51, 52, 53, to have derived similar engine support structure and landing gear support structure from the original parts are obvious steps one skilled in the art would have taken.

Re claim 46, to make the insert portions contiguous are obvious steps one skilled in the art would have taken.

Please note that separation lines can be defined where the wing inserts are located in the wing.

Please note that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have utilized the wing insert portions forward of the landing gear or outboard of the engine support so that the aircraft can increases its strength and performance.

Please see the lines drawn on the Murphy et al reference as to how the examiner interpret the spanwise and chordwise separation lines.

Claims 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy et al as modified by Franz and Klose as applied to claims 15 and 29 above, and further in view of Mix.

Murphy et al as modified by Franz and Klose discloses all claimed parts except for the use of fuselage inserts in the space defined by the forward and aft fuselage portion. However, Mix discloses that fuselage inserts in the space defined by the forward and aft fuselage portion are well known the art (see the figures).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the fuselage of Murphy's et al into forward and aft fuselage portions with fuselage inserts in between to allow the easier manufacturing of the aircraft.

Please note that deriving a second fuselage/aircraft from a first fuselage/aircraft is obvious to one skilled in the art by merely replacing the old parts with new and different parts if desired. Therefore, the first and second forward fuselage portion and the first and second aft fuselage portions are generally the same if the first fuselage portions are replaced with generally the same, but brand new second fuselage portions.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Voigt, Hawkins et al, and Inoue et al disclose aircraft means.

Application/Control Number: 10/827,460 Page 5

Art Unit: 3644

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 703-308-2798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD

Tù sư